



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/921,924	08/06/2001	Hidesato Matsuoka	1086.1147	8570

21171 7590 07/08/2005

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

SHORTLEDGE, THOMAS E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2654

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/921,924

Applicant(s)

MATSUOKA ET AL.

Examiner

Thomas E. Shortledge

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☒ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. An application in which the benefits of an earlier application are desired must contain a specific reference to the prior application(s) in the first sentence(s) of the specification or in an application data sheet by identifying the prior application by application number (37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) and (a)(5)). If the prior application is a non-provisional application, the specific reference must also include the relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) between the applications except when the reference is to a prior application of a CPA assigned the same application number.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 1-29 are objected to because of the following informalities: They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 3, 5, 9-11, 16, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, and 26 are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 14, 17, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mani et al. (Identifying Unknown Proper Names in Newswire Text).

As to claims 1 and 14, Mani et al. teach:

a specificity calculating extracting means an expression specifying a person from the input document and for calculating a specificity to evaluate a degree of intensity at which the expression specifying a person (parsing a text to find the proper name mentions, and using a confidence score along with various knowledge sources to decided if the name mention is actually a name, page 47) and;

an anonymity setting processing means an expression specifying a person in the input document having a specificity which is greater than a predetermined threshold, (if the name mention is found to be above a certain confidence level, it is found to be a name, page 47).

As to claims 4, and 17, Mani et al. teach:

a sentence extracting means extracting a sentence from an input document (page 47);

a part-of-speech analyzing means decomposing the extracted sentence for each part of speech (tokenizing the sentence, page 47);

a name extracting means extracting a person name based on a person name extracting rule from a result of the part-of-speech analysis (finding name mentions based on the surrounding text, page 46); and

a name specificity calculating means calculating a specificity of the name thus extracted based on statistical information (calculating the confidence level of the name with information provided by various knowledge sources, page 47).

As to claim 6, Mani et al. teach the specificity calculating unit includes a reference specificity database registering specificity data having a set of an expression specifying a person, a type of a person name or a modification expression and a specificity which are created based on an existing document (a knowledge source having multiple hypotheses with different confidence measures, page 48).

As to claims 7, and 20, Mani et al. teach the specificity calculating unit includes a database creating means extracting a person name and a modification expression for each document from an existing document of a document database to calculate a specificity and for creating a reference specificity database registering a specificity data having a set of an expression specifying a person, a type of person name or a modification expression and a specificity (a knowledge source having multiple hypotheses with different confidence measures, where the knowledge source is able to extract information source document and use the information for pattern matching, pages 48-49).

As to claims 8, and 21, Mani et al. teach the anonymity setting processing unit has a non-anonymity requiring database registering a non-anonymity requiring expression and a expression registered in the non-anonymity requiring database in an expression specifying a person extracted from an input document is not rewritten to anonymity expression (finding a persons name in document based on the context surrounding the name mention, and a confidence level with a knowledge source, where when a proper name is found to meet the confidence level, it is not rewritten, pages 47-49).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2, 12, 13, 15, 25, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mani et al. as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of Rubin et al. (6,654,724).

As to claims 2, and 15, Mani et al. teach the specificity calculating unit extracts a person name from the input document and calculates a specificity to evaluate a degree of intensity at which the person name thus extracted can specify a person (parsing a text to find the proper name mentions, and using a confidence score along with various knowledge sources to decided if the name mention is actually a name, page 47).

Mani et al. do not teach the anonymity setting processing unit rewrites a person name having a specificity which is greater than a predetermined threshold.

However Rubin et al. teach removing patient identity from any data transmitted and replacing the patient identity with generic terms (col. 6, lines 57-65).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the name identifier of Mani et al. with the name replacement processes of Rubin et al. to increase the confidential ability of the system as taught by Rubin et al. (col. 6, lines 15-20).

As to claims 12 and 27, Mani et al. do not teach the anonymity setting processing step encodes an expression specifying a person extracted from an input document, thereby carrying out anonymity setting.

However, Rubin et al. teach providing encryption for a data transfer, where the data transfer includes patient information, (col. 7, lines 10-12).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the name identifier of Mani et al. with the name replacement processes of Rubin et al. to increase the confidential ability of the system as taught by Rubin et al. (col. 6, lines 15-20).

As to claims 13, and 28, Mani et al. teach a decrypting indicating step of decoding and displaying an encrypted expression specifying a person when reading an anonymity setting document which is subjected to the anonymity setting through the encoding a the anonymity setting processing step.

However, Rubin et al. teach providing encryption for a data transfer, where the data transfer includes patient information, (col. 7, lines 10-12). It would be necessary that since the data is encrypted, the system would be able to decode the encrypted expression, allowing the user access to the information.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the name identifier of Mani et al. with the name replacement processes of Rubin et al. to increase the confidential ability of the system as taught by Rubin et al. (col. 6, lines 15-20).

As to claim 25, Mani et al. do not teach the anonymity setting processing step replace an expression which specifies a person extracted from an input document into a rewriting to meaningless express.

However Rubin et al. teach removing patient identity from any data transmitted and replacing the patient identity with generic terms (col. 6, lines 57-65).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the name identifier of Mani et al. with the name replacement processes of Rubin et al. to increase the confidential ability of the system as taught by Rubin et al. (col. 6, lines 15-20).

9. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mani et al. above, and further in view of Rubin et al.

As to claim 29, Mani et al. teach a specificity calculating an expression specifying a person from the input document and calculating a specificity to evaluate a degree of intensity at which the expression specifying a person (parsing a text to find the proper name mentions, and using a confidence score along with various knowledge sources to decided if the name mention is actually a name, page 47); and

an expression which has a greater specificity than a predetermined threshold (a confidence score, and the name is determined to be a name if it is above a certain threshold, page 47).

Mani et al. do not teach replacement a expression in the input document.

However, Rubin et al. teach removing patient identity from any data transmitted and replacing the patient identity with generic terms (col. 6, lines 57-65).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the name identifier of Mani et al. with the name replacement processes of Rubin et al. to increase the confidential ability of the system as taught by Rubin et al. (col. 6, lines 15-20).

Conclusion


10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas E. Shortledge whose telephone number is (571)272-7612. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2654

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



RICHMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TS
6/14/05